

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-28 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

#### **A. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 6, and 15-21 contain allowable subject matter.

#### **B. §103 Rejection Over Hirano in view of Sakai**

Claims 1, 7-14, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hirano (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191990) in view of Sakai (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,720). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7-14, and 22-28 would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and that claims 1, 7-14, and 22-28 are therefore patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai.

##### **1. Claims 1 and 26-28**

Referring to Fig. 1 of Hirano, the Examiner asserts that Hirano's photosensitive member 1 corresponds to a photoconductive medium as recited in claim 1, that Hirano's developer roller 20 corresponds to a developing roller as recited in claim 1, and that Hirano's toner supply member 22 corresponds to a toner supplying roller as recited in claim 1. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 2, paragraph 3, Hirano does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 corresponds to a cleaning unit as recited in claim 1, and that it would have been obvious to modify Hirano's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove from the toner supplying roller 42 toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

roller 42 to the developing roller 41. In fact, directly opposite to claim 1, Sakai describes that "since the bias voltage applied to cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42, the toner can be efficiently supplied to supplying roller 42" (emphasis added). See Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37. Sakai further describes that "cleaning roller 45 is provided to remove the toner from the regulating roller 43 surface and to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 in an efficient manner" (emphasis added). See Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45. Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 1 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1.

Because Hirano and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1, the combination of Hirano and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Hirano in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and thus claim 1 is patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai. Claims 26-28 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, these dependent claims would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and are patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai, for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1 and 26-28 are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

2. Claims 7-14 and 22

Referring to Fig. 1 of Hirano, the Examiner asserts that Hirano's toner tank 25 corresponds to a toner receptacle as recited in claim 7, that Hirano's developer roller 20 corresponds to a developing roller as recited in claim 7, and that Hirano's toner supply member 22 corresponds to a toner supplying roller as recited in claim 7. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 2, paragraph 3, Hirano does not teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 corresponds to a cleaning roller as recited in claim 7, and that it would have been obvious to modify Hirano's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove toner from the toner supplying roller 42. In fact, directly opposite to claim 7, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 7 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7.

Because Hirano and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7, the combination of Hirano and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7. Accordingly, Hirano in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 7.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 7 would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and thus claim 7 is patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai. Claims 8-14 and 22 depend from claim 7 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 7. Accordingly, these dependent claims would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and are patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai, for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

with respect to claim 7. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 7-14 and 22 are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 23

Referring to Fig. 1 of Hirano, the Examiner asserts that Hirano's photosensitive member 1 corresponds to a photoconductive medium as recited in claim 23, that Hirano's toner tank 25 corresponds to a toner receptacle as recited in claim 23, that Hirano's developer roller 20 corresponds to a developing roller as recited in claim 23, and that Hirano's toner supply member 22 corresponds to a toner supplying roller as recited in claim 23. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 2, paragraph 3, Hirano does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 corresponds to a cleaning unit as recited in claim 23, and that it would have been obvious to modify Hirano's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not shake the fur of the toner supplying roller 42 to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller 42. In fact, directly opposite to claim 23, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 23 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23.

Because Hirano and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23, the combination of Hirano and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, Hirano in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 23.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 23 would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and thus claim 23 is patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 23 are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 24

Referring to Fig. 1 of Hirano, the Examiner asserts that Hirano describes supplying toner stored in a toner tank 25 of a developing unit to a developer roller 20 by using a toner supplying member 22 disposed within the developing unit, and that the toner supplying member 22 may be formed in a fur brush shape. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 2, paragraph 3, Hirano does not teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 removes residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation, and that it would have been obvious to modify Hirano's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation. In fact, directly opposite to claim 24, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 24 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24.

Because Hirano and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24, the combination of Hirano and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24. Accordingly, Hirano in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 24.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 24 would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and thus claim 24 is patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 24 are respectfully requested.

5. Claim 25

Referring to Fig. 1 of Hirano, the Examiner asserts that Hirano describes transferring toner from a toner tank 25 of a developing unit to a developer roller 20 with a toner supplying member 22 to develop a toner image on a photosensitive member 1, and that the toner supplying member 22 may be formed in a fur brush shape. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 2, paragraph 3, Hirano does not teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 removes residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation, and that it would have been obvious to modify Hirano's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation. In fact, directly opposite to claim 25, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 25 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25.

Because Hirano and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25, the combination of Hirano and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25. Accordingly, Hirano in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 25.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 25 would not have been obvious over Hirano in view of Sakai, and thus claim 25 is patentable over Hirano in view of Sakai. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 25 are respectfully requested.

**C. §103 Rejection over Yamamoto in view of Sakai**

Claims 1-4, 7-14, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,434) in view of Sakai. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 7-14, and 22-28 would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and that claims 1-4, 7-14, and 22-28 are therefore patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai.

1. Claims 1-4 and 26-28

Referring to Fig. 1 of Yamamoto, the Examiner asserts that Yamamoto's photosensitive drum 10 corresponds to a photoconductive medium as recited in claim 1, that Yamamoto's developing sleeve 1 corresponds to a developing roller as recited in claim 1, and that Yamamoto's supply brush 4 corresponds to a toner supplying roller as recited in claim 1. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 3, paragraph 5, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 corresponds to a cleaning unit as recited in claim 1, and that it would have been obvious to modify Yamamoto's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove from the toner supplying roller 42 toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller 42 to the developing roller 41. In fact, directly opposite to claim 1, Sakai describes that "since the bias voltage applied to cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42, the toner can be efficiently supplied to supplying roller 42" (emphasis added). See Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37. Sakai further describes that "cleaning roller 45 is

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

provided to remove the toner from the regulating roller 43 surface and to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 in an efficient manner" (emphasis added). See Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45. Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 1 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1.

Because Yamamoto and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1, the combination of Yamamoto and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit disposed at a position opposite to the predetermined nip with respect to a rotating axis of the toner supplying roller to remove from the toner supplying roller the toner which remains after the toner is transferred from the toner supplying roller to the developing roller," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Yamamoto in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and thus claim 1 is patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai. Claims 2-4 and 26-28 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, these dependent claims would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and are patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1-4 and 26-28 are respectfully requested.

## 2. Claims 7-14 and 22

Referring to Fig. 1 of Yamamoto, the Examiner asserts that Yamamoto's developing container 3 corresponds to a toner receptacle as recited in claim 7, that Yamamoto's developing sleeve 1 corresponds to a developing roller as recited in claim 7, and that Yamamoto's supply brush 4 corresponds to a toner supplying roller as recited in claim 7. As acknowledged by the



Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

Examiner in the Office Action at p. 3, paragraph 5, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 corresponds to a cleaning roller as recited in claim 7, and that it would have been obvious to modify Yamamoto's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove toner from the toner supplying roller 42. In fact, directly opposite to claim 7, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 7 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7.

Because Yamamoto and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7, the combination of Yamamoto and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 7. Accordingly, Yamamoto in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 7.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 7 would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and thus claim 7 is patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai. Claims 8-14 and 22 depend from claim 7 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 7. Accordingly, these dependent claims would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and are patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 7. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 7-14 and 22 are respectfully requested.

### 3. Claim 23

Referring to Fig. 1 of Yamamoto, the Examiner asserts that Yamamoto's photosensitive drum 10 corresponds to a photoconductive medium as recited in claim 23, that Yamamoto's

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

developing container 3 corresponds to a toner receptacle as recited in claim 23, that Yamamoto's developing sleeve 1 corresponds to a developing roller as recited in claim 23, and that Yamamoto's supply brush 4 corresponds to a toner supplying roller as recited in claim 23. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 3, paragraph 5, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 corresponds to a cleaning unit as recited in claim 23, and that it would have been obvious to modify Yamamoto's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not shake the fur of the toner supplying roller 42 to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller 42. In fact, directly opposite to claim 23, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 23 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23.

Because Yamamoto and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23, the combination of Yamamoto and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "a cleaning unit to shake the fur of the toner supplying roller to remove the toner from the toner supplying roller," as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, Yamamoto in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 23.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 23 would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and thus claim 23 is patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 23 are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

4. Claim 24

Referring to Fig. 1 of Yamamoto, the Examiner asserts that Yamamoto describes supplying toner stored in a developing container 3 of a developing unit to a developing sleeve 1 by using a supply brush 4 disposed within the developing unit, and that the supply brush 4 may be formed in a fur brush shape. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 3, paragraph 5, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 removes residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation, and that it would have been obvious to modify Yamamoto's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation. In fact, directly opposite to claim 24, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 24 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24.

Because Yamamoto and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24, the combination of Yamamoto and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing residual toner remaining on the toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller after the toner supplying operation," as recited in claim 24. Accordingly, Yamamoto in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 24.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 24 would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and thus claim 24 is patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 24 are respectfully requested.

5. Claim 25

Referring to Fig. 1 of Yamamoto, the Examiner asserts that Yamamoto describes transferring toner from a developing container 3 of a developing unit to a developing sleeve 1 with a supply brush 4 to develop a toner image on a photosensitive drum 10, and that the supply brush 4 may be formed in a fur brush shape. As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Office Action at p. 3, paragraph 5, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25.

However, referring to Figs. 9, 12B, and 13 of Sakai, the Examiner asserts that Sakai's cleaning roller 45 removes residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation, and that it would have been obvious to modify Yamamoto's developing apparatus to include Sakai's cleaning roller 45. In contrast to the Examiner's assertion, Sakai's cleaning roller 45 does not remove residual toner remaining on the toner supplying member 22 after a toner supplying operation. In fact, directly opposite to claim 25, Sakai describes that the cleaning roller 45 causes the toner to move to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 35-37), and that the cleaning roller 45 is provided to supply the toner to supplying roller 42 (see Sakai at col. 24, lines 42-45). Thus, Sakai teaches away from claim 25 by requiring that the cleaning roller 45 supplies toner to (as opposed to removes toner from) the toner supplying roller 42. Accordingly, Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25.

Because Yamamoto and Sakai do not individually teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25, the combination of Yamamoto and Sakai also does not teach or suggest "removing the toner remaining on a toner supplying roller with a cleaning roller," as recited in claim 25. Accordingly, Yamamoto in view of Sakai does not teach or suggest every limitation of claim 25.

Serial No.: 10/716,563  
Docket No.: 102-1011  
Amendment dated November 2, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action of August 10, 2006

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 25 would not have been obvious over Yamamoto in view of Sakai, and thus claim 25 is patentable over Yamamoto in view of Sakai. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 25 are respectfully requested.

**D. Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

By: 

Philip A. Caramanica Jr.  
Registration No. 51,528

Dated: November 2, 2006  
919 18<sup>th</sup> St., NW, Suite 440  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 775-1900  
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901